

Route 1, Box 275
Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387
February 28, 1968

Dear Harold Weisberg:

Thanks for your note. I have completed a zerox copy of the relevant parts of the Journal of Forensic Sciences and am sending it herewith.

I feel that an outstanding feature of this panel on the Warren Report is that Dr. Cyril Wecht concurs with the Warren Commission in its findings in his presentation, while disagreeing with the way the forensic pathologists should have been chosen. He thus points out a key weakness even while he agreed with the Report, and then he later changed his mind and took strong exception with the conclusions of the Report. He thus showed the results of an objective mind assuming the honesty of the Warren Commission and the Warren Report changing conclusions as he got better acquainted with the evidence. This is stronger for our purposes than if he had been one of the most critical of the panel -- though it takes some care to point this out. Dr. Wecht's standing makes him an important person to refer to in this regard. Sylvia Meagher quotes him, but did not bring out some of these features of the matter.

Did you notice that Senator Eugene McCarthy had spoken out on the Warren Commission? A news report in the Dayton Daily News has it that "McCarthy charged that 'One of the most disturbing moves in the direction of the erosion of the integrity of our institutions' was the appointment of Chief Justice Earl Warren to head the commission to investigate the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

"The Warren appointment may have helped make the Commission's findings more acceptable to the people," McCarthy said. "But because of what the Commission would have to report, the use of the chief justice was likely to reflect on the man himself and the court."

The implications are clear. Thus McCarthy is about the first man in national office or running for one who has spoken out in regard to the central issue. What more he will do with it remains to be seen.

Best wishes,

Gris

Griscom Morgan